

1 REMARKS

2 Status of the Claims

3 Claims 1-42 remain pending in the application, Claims 1, 10, 19, 25, 31, 35, 36, and 37
4 having been amended to more clearly distinguish the subject matter from the cited art.

5 Claims 1-42 Rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

6 Claims 1-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferguson et al.
7 (U.S. Published Application No. 2002/0129054 - hereinafter referred to as "Ferguson") and Dwek et
8 al. (U.S. Patent No. 2001/0018858. Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection for the
9 reasons set forth below.

10 In the interest of reducing the complexity of the issues for the Examiner to consider in this
11 response, the following discussion focuses on independent Claims 1, 10, 19, 25, 31, 35, 36, and
12 37. The patentability of each remaining dependent claim is not necessarily separately addressed
13 in detail. However, applicants' decision not to discuss the differences between the cited art and
14 each dependent claim should not be considered as an admission that applicants concur with the
15 Examiner's conclusion that these dependent claims are not patentable over the disclosure in the
16 cited reference. Similarly, applicants' decision not to discuss differences between the prior art
17 and every claim element, or every comment made by the Examiner, should not be considered as
18 an admission that applicants concur with the Examiner's interpretation and assertions regarding
19 those claims. Indeed, applicants believe that all of the dependent claims patentably distinguish
20 over the reference cited. However, a specific traverse of the rejection of each dependent claim is
21 not required, since dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as the
22 independent claims from which the dependent claims ultimately depend.

23 Patentability of Independent Claim 1

24 Significant differences exist between applicants' claim recitation and the cited art because the
25 cited art does NOT teach or suggest enabling a user to produce customized functions and displays for
26 file management of a plurality of files in a directory structure. It may be helpful to illustrate an
27 example of applicants' claimed subject matter. Applicants' step (a) recites:

28 in the application program, providing a dialog box object that communicates
29 with a browser module;
30

1 For example, applicants disclose if a user is working with a word processing application
2 program, and selects a menu function such as “Open File,” as indicated by step 122 of FIGURE 5, the
3 selected menu function dialog box is opened. What is initiated is a Microsoft Office File Open dialog
4 object, also known as an msoFileOpenDialog. (See Specification, page 11, line 32-page, 12, line 12).
5 In addition, the specification explains that in connection with step 124 of FIGURE 5, a user can
6 indicate the URL of a document and in a step 126, the application program dialog box then requests
7 from the server, information indicating the server type. Based on the information received from the
8 server, the dialog object determines if the server is capable of providing Web view pages in a
9 step 128. If so, an appropriate request is sent for displaying the web page at the indicated URL. In a
10 step 134, upon receiving a response from the server, the dialog object determines whether a web view
11 is available. If so, then in a step 136, the dialog object loads a browser module (but not a full,
12 separate stand-alone browser application program). This is one example of providing a dialog box
13 object (e.g., msoFileOpenDialog) in an application program (e.g., word processing application) that
14 communicates with a browser module and implements the steps outlined in FIGURE 5.

15 Applicants step (b) recites (as amended):

16 displaying the Web view page in the dialog box of the application program, wherein
17 the Web view page integrates a browser capability into the application program to
18 enable a user to produce customized functions and displays for file management of
19 one or more files in a directory structure within the dialog box of the application
20 program, without having to enable access to one of a different application program
21 and a browser program;

22 For example, FIGURE 3B illustrates a corresponding “Web view” display of the URL in prior
23 art FIGURE 3A, when for example, a user has accessed a word processing program and has activated
24 a dialog box shown as FIGURE 3B’s File Open dialog box 60, that shows Web view content 100.

25 As indicated by the specification at page 10, lines 7-17, the content of Web view content 100
26 is controlled by the author of the Web view page, and thus, the file information and other content that
27 is displayed does not have to be displayed in a conventional format or a format specified by an
28 operating system. Thus, the author can display information and content in whatever manner the
29 author desires. And, there is no need to execute a separate Web browser program (see applicants’
30 specification, page 8, lines 32-34).

1 For example, as noted in the specification at page 10, lines 7-17, the author may choose to
2 include a graphic element 102 as shown in FIGURE 3B as part of the customized directory structure
3 in order to aid in display and management of the plurality of files. The author may choose to even
4 include an audio clip or video clip. Also, a filtering function may be employed (see applicants'
5 specification, page 11, lines 4-5). Furthermore, as shown in FIGURE 4, the file directory structure is
6 customized to display the author of each document and the location of a customer to which each
7 document file is related (*Id*, lines 17-18).

8 Thus, applicants illustrate an example of displaying the Web view page (e.g., Web view
9 content 100) in the dialog box (e.g., dialog box 60) of the application program (e.g., WORD),
10 wherein the Web view page integrates a browser capability into the application program to enable a
11 user to produce customized functions and display for file management (e.g., a page of web view
12 content that is controlled by the Web view page author) **of one or more files in a directory**
13 **structure** within the dialog box of the application program, without the need to execute either a
14 different application program or a browser program.

15 In contrast, the cited art does NOT teach or suggest producing customized functions and
16 displays for *file management of one or more files in a directory structure within the dialog box* of
17 the application program, because Ferguson does not perform file management *within a directory*
18 *structure* and Dwek does not teach or suggest any type of file management taking place within its
19 dial-up dialog box. Rather, as noted by the Examiner's motivation to combine the cited references,
20 Ferguson and Dwek are directed toward integrating Internet/web pages to distribute multimedia
21 content, as opposed to producing customized functions and displays for file management. Applicants
22 have amended the definition of a web view page to clarify that a user is enabled to produce
23 customized functions and displays for *file management of one or more files in a directory structure*
24 *within the dialog box*. Applicants do not perceive where Ferguson teaches or suggests any equivalent
25 of a directory structure for managing one or more files, such as shown in applicants' FIGURES 3B
26 and 4. Applicants also note that although Dwek discloses a dial-up dialog box, Dwek's dial-up
27 dialog box is for allowing a user to specify the user's protocol, including for example, an access
28 number, (Dwek, paragraph 0033). Therefore, Dwek does not teach or suggest file management of
29 one or more files within a directory structure.
30

1 Accordingly, since the cited art in combination does not teach or suggest *file management of*
2 *one or more files in a directory structure*, the rejection of independent Claim 1 over the cited art
3 should be withdrawn. Because dependent claims include all of the elements of the independent claim
4 from which the dependent claims ultimately depend, dependent Claims 2-9 are patentable for at least
5 the reasons discussed above in regard to independent Claim 1. Accordingly, the rejection of
6 dependent Claims 2-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

7 Patentability of Independent Claim 10

8 Significant differences exist between applicants' claim recitation and the cited art because the
9 cited art does NOT teach or suggest production of customized functions and displays for file
10 management of one or more files in a directory structure. Step (a) as amended, recites:

11 determining whether a computing resource supports a Web view page in the
12 application program dialog box, *wherein the Web view page integrates a browser*
13 *capability into the application program to enable a user to produce customized*
14 *functions and displays for file management of one or more files in a directory*
15 *structure within the dialog box of the application program, without having to enable*
16 *access to one of a different application program and a browser program;*

16 The Examiner has cited art stating that it teaches the italicized portion of Independent
17 Claim 10 reproduced above. However, for the same reasons presented above in connection with
18 traversing the rejection of independent Claim 1, independent Claim 10 also distinguishes over the cited art
19 because the cited art does NOT teach or suggest production of customized functions and displays for file
20 management of one or more files in a directory structure

21 Thus, the rejection of independent Claim 10 over the cited art should be withdrawn. Because
22 dependent claims include all of the elements of the independent claim from which the dependent
23 claims ultimately depend, dependent Claims 11-18 are patentable for at least the reasons discussed
24 above in regard to independent Claim 10. Accordingly, the rejection of dependent Claims 11-18,
25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

26 Patentability of Independent Claim 19

27 Significant differences exist between applicants' claim recitation and the cited art because the
28 cited art does NOT teach or suggest enabling a user to produce customized functions and displays for
29 file management of one or more files in a directory structure. Step (c) as amended recites:

1 displaying the Web view page within the application program dialog box, *wherein the*
2 *Web view page integrates a browser capability into the application program to enable*
3 *a user to produce customized functions and displays for file management of one or*
4 *more files in a directory structure within the dialog box of the application program,*
5 *without having to enable access to one of a different application program and a*
6 *browser program;*

7 The Examiner has applied the cited art against the italicized portion of independent Claim 19
8 reproduced above for reasons similar to those discussed above in regard to independent Claim 1.
9 However, for the same reasons presented above in connection with traversing the rejection of independent
10 Claim 1, independent Claim 19 also distinguishes over the cited art because the cited art does NOT teach or
11 suggest production of customized functions and displays for file management of one or more files in a
12 directory structure.

13 Thus, the rejection of independent Claim 19 over the cited art should be withdrawn. Because
14 dependent claims include all of the elements of the independent claim from which the dependent
15 claims ultimately depend, dependent Claims 20-24 are patentable for at least the reasons discussed
16 above in regard to independent Claim 19. Accordingly, the rejection of dependent Claims 20-24,
17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

18 Patentability of Independent Claim 25

19 Significant differences exist between applicants' claim recitation and the cited art because the
20 cited art does NOT teach or suggest enabling a user to produce customized functions and displays for
21 file management of one or more files in a directory structure. Step (a) (as amended) recites:

22 enabling a user to selectively activate display of a Web view page within the dialog
23 box of the application program, *wherein the Web view page integrates a browser*
24 *capability into the application program to enable a user to produce customized*
25 *functions and displays for file management of one or more files in a directory*
26 *structure within the the dialog box of the application program, without having to*
27 *enable access to one of a different application program and a browser program;*

28 The Examiner has applied the cited art against the italicized portion of independent Claim 25
29 reproduced above for reasons similar to those given in the rejection of independent Claim 1.
30 However, for the same reasons presented above in connection with traversing that rejection, independent
Claim 25 also distinguishes over the cited art because the cited art does NOT teach or suggest production of
customized functions and displays for file management of one or more files in a directory structure.

1 Thus, the rejection of independent Claim 25 over the cited art should be withdrawn. Because
2 dependent claims include all of the elements of the independent claim from which the dependent
3 claims ultimately depend, dependent Claims 26-30 are patentable for at least the reasons discussed
4 above in regard to independent Claim 25. Accordingly, the rejection of dependent Claims 26-30,
5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

6 Patentability of Independent Claim 31

7 Significant differences exist between applicants' claim recitation and the cited art because the
8 cited art does NOT teach or suggest enabling a user to produce customized functions and displays for
9 file management of one or more files in a directory structure. Step (a) (as amended) of independent
10 Claim 31 recites:

11 enabling a user to selectively activate display of a Web view page within the dialog
12 box of the application program, *wherein the Web view page integrates a browser*
13 *capability into the application program to enable a user to produce customized*
14 *functions and displays for file management of one or more files in a directory*
15 *structure within the dialog box of the application program, without having to enable*
16 *access to one of a different application program and a browser program*

17 The Examiner has applied the cited references against the italicized portion of independent
18 Claim 31 above for reasons similar to those discussed above in regard to independent Claim 1.
19 However, for the same reasons presented above in connection with traversing the rejection of independent
20 Claim 1, independent Claim 31 also distinguishes over the cited art, because the cited art does NOT teach or
21 suggest production of customized functions and displays for file management of one or more files in a
22 directory structure.

23 Thus, the rejection of independent Claim 31 over the cited art should be withdrawn. Because
24 dependent claims include all of the elements of the independent claim from which the dependent
25 claims ultimately depend, dependent Claims 32-34 are patentable for at least the reasons discussed
26 above in regard to independent Claim 31. Accordingly, the rejection of dependent Claims 32-34,
27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

28 Patentability of Independent Claim 35

29 Significant differences exist between applicants' claim recitation and the cited art because the
30 cited art does NOT teach or suggest enabling a user to produce customized functions and displays for

1 file management of one or more files in a directory structure. Independent Claim 35 (as amended)
2 recites:

3 A machine readable medium storing machine instructions for selectively opening a
4 dialog box in an application program; and displaying a Web view page within the
5 dialog box of the application program to enable a user to selectively execute a function
6 from within the dialog box by selecting an element on the Web view page, *wherein the*
7 *Web view page integrates a browser capability into the application program to enable*
8 *a user to produce customized functions and displays for file management of one or*
9 *more files in a directory structure within the dialog box of the application program,*
10 *without having to enable access to one of a different application program and a*
11 *browser program.*

12 The Examiner has rejected the italic portion of Independent Claim 35 above for reasons
13 similar to those given for Independent Claim 1. However, for the same reasons presented above in
14 connection with traversing the rejection of independent Claim 1, independent Claim 35 also distinguishes
15 over the cited art because the cited art does NOT teach or suggest production of customized functions and
16 displays for file management of one or more files in a directory structure. Accordingly, the rejection
17 of independent Claim 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the cited art should be withdrawn.

18 Patentability of Independent Claim 36

19 Significant differences exist between applicants' claim recitation and the cited art because the
20 cited art does NOT teach or suggest enabling a user to produce customized functions and displays for
21 file management of one or more files in a directory structure. Independent Claim 36 recites:

22 A machine readable medium storing machine instructions for generating a Web view
23 page for display within a dialog box of an application program in response to a request
24 for opening the Web view page in the dialog box, *wherein the Web view page*
25 *integrates a browser capability into the application program to enable a user to*
26 *produce customized functions and displays for file management of one or more files in*
27 *a directory structure within the dialog box of the application program, without having*
28 *to enable access to one of a different application program and a browser program*

29 The Examiner has applied the cited art against the italicized portion of independent Claim 36
30 reproduced above for reasons similar to those given in the rejection of independent Claim 1.
However, for the same reasons presented above in connection with traversing the rejection of independent
Claim 1, independent Claim 36 also distinguishes over the cited art because the cited art does NOT teach or
suggest production of customized functions and displays for file management of one or more files in a

1 directory structure. Accordingly, the rejection of independent Claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)
2 over the cited art should be withdrawn.

3 Patentability of Independent Claim 37

4 Significant differences exist between applicants' claim recitation and the cited art because the
5 cited art does NOT teach or suggest enabling a user to produce customized functions and displays for
6 file management of one or more files in a directory structure. Function (e)(iii) (as amended) of
7 Independent Claim 37 recites:

8 displaying the Web view page within the dialog box, on the display, *wherein the Web*
9 *view page integrates a browser capability into the application program to enable a*
10 *user to produce customized functions and displays for file management of one or more*
11 *files in a directory structure within the dialog box of the application program, without*
12 *having to enable access to one of a different application program and a browser*
13 *program.*

14 The Examiner has applied the art against the italicized portion of independent Claim 37
15 reproduced above for reasons similar to those asserted in his rejection of independent Claim 1.
16 However, for the same reasons presented above in connection with traversing the rejection of independent
17 Claim 1, independent Claim 37 also distinguishes over the cited art because the cited art does NOT teach or
18 suggest production of customized functions and displays for file management of one or more files in a
19 directory structure. Accordingly, the rejection of independent Claim 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)
20 over the cited art should be withdrawn.

21 In view of the Remarks set forth above, it will be apparent that the claims in this application
22 define a novel and non-obvious invention. The application is in condition for allowance and should
23 be passed to issue without further delay. Should any further questions remain, the Examiner is
24 invited to telephone applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

25 Respectfully submitted,

26 /sabrina k. macintyre/
27 Sabrina K. MacIntyre
28 Registration No. 56,912

29 SKM/RMA:elm
30